

REMARKS

In the present Office Action the Examiner submits that the response filed on January 13, 2005 was non-compliant for failing to list all the claims in the application and to provide each claim with a proper status identifier. Applicants point out that the last response did not include any amendment to the claims but a rebuttal to rejections and objections submitted by the Examiner in the Office Action of July 13, 2005.

The rebuttal to the objections attempted to correct a mistaken impression on the part of the Examiner that the claim set contained multiply dependent claims that depend on multiply dependent claims. The rebuttal pointed out that all multiple dependencies had been removed in a preliminary amendment, which was filed together with the national filing of the application on May 7, 2001. A copy of the preliminary amendment showing the removal of multiple dependencies was submitted with the response of January 13, 2005.

It was more than surprising to receive the last Office Action indicating that the preliminary amendment, the only amendment made to the claims from the time of the national filing, was non-compliant. The preliminary amendment was fully compliant on the date, May 7, 2001, on which it was filed and no objections for non-compliance had been raised in the first two office actions issued by the patent office. Be that as it may, applicants attach hereto a complete set of claims, with status identifiers, as amended in the preliminary amendment and, since no subsequent amendments to the claims were made, as they presently stand.

Applicants point out that the present claim set includes 58 claims of which claims 1-30 and 50-53 were chosen for examination in the response filed on April 8, 2004 to the requirement for restriction mailed on February 10, 2004.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner respond to the content of the last response filed on January 13, 2005 and renew their request made in the last response, that the Examiner retract his objection to claims 11-30 and address their patentability in a next office action.

An action on the merits is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,
E. KANTOROVICH, et al.


Allan C. ENTIS
Reg. # 52,866

February 28, 2005
William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650
Tel: (212) 521-5400